

REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 3-9. Claims 1, 3-6 and 9 are amended herein, and new claim 10 is added. No new matter is presented. Claim 2 remains cancelled. Thus, claims 1 and 3-10 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 1 and 3-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,155,840 (Sallette), U.S. Patent No. 6,199,076 (Logan) and U.S. Patent No. 5,774,662 (Sakagawa).

Sallette displays data stream such as digital video as the presenter selects the source from the selection box. In Sallette, the presenter computer system (106) is used by the presenter to communicate with the audience members and control information streaming from a digital feed of a video camera or a device providing a live or pre-recorded output (see, col. 4, line 66 through col. 5, line 9). The presenter selects the digital feed content from the selection list box (618) listing possible sources (see, col. 7, lines 66 through col. 8, line 7). That is, Sallette is limited to continuous display of streaming data to the audience members.

The Examiner relies on Logan as teaching sequence numbers representing the output sequence. Logan discusses a recommended program sequence file which provisionally identifies the order in which downloaded program segments are to be played that can be reviewed and altered by the user using a utility program previously supplied by the server based on subscription of the user (see, col. 8, lines 39-53). Accordingly, Logan identifies characteristics (duration and subject matter) and provides the segments based on subscription information of the listener for selection (see, Fig. 2 including corresponding text).

Starting on page 17 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner appears to imply that even though Sakagawa does not state the address is URL information, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Sakagawa because a MAC address uniquely identifies each node of a network using an IP address and a URL also specifies an IP address. Applicants respectfully disagree. In particular, Sallette and Logan do not provide the proposed modification of the Sakagawa system and the record fails to support the proposed modification of the Sakagawa system.

Further, even if Sakagawa was modified, the claimed use of URL information is different than the ATM address table storing a corresponding relationship between a protocol address and ATM address of the terminals (see, Fig. 12 including corresponding text).

Independent claim 1, by way of example, recites, "sequentially transmitting a plurality of pieces of obtained URL information to the remote side computer terminals", "storing a correspondence relationship between the plurality of pieces of URL information and a plurality of sequence numbers representing the output sequence and storing an address table [of] respective terminal addresses of the local side computer terminal and the remote side computer terminals." Claim 1 further recites that system determines "whether each of the local side computer terminal and the remote side computer terminals is to be notified" and causes data accessed using the URL information to be displayed "at a predetermined interval indicating a display time period of each page accessed using the URL information via each remote side computer terminal determined to be notified of the URL information."

Similarly, claim 3 recites, "storing a correspondence relationship between pieces of URL information sequence numbers representing the predetermined output sequence", including determining "whether the received piece of URL information is to be accepted and notified to the browser unit by referring to the address table" and displaying data accessed using the URL information "a predetermined interval indicating a display time period of each page accessed using the URL information via each remote side computer terminal determined to be notified of the URL information." Claims 4-6 recite similar features.

Independent claim 9 recites, "storing URL information of web pages in accordance with a series of display sequence numbers specified by a presenter" and "selectively displaying data accessible using the URL information at an interval and a display time period of each web page accessed using the URL information specified by the presenter", where the URL information is stored as "a bookmark on said terminals identified responsive to an instruction from the presenter."

The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above-identified features of the independent claims.

It is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over the cited references.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, as recited in claim 8, "said control unit causes

bookmark data stored in the local side presenter controlled computer terminal to be registered into a remote side computer terminal based on instruction from the local side presenter controlled terminal." The cited references do not teach or suggest these features of claim 8.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM:

New claim 10 has been added to recite, "obtaining address information of web pages in accordance with a sequence indicated by a presenter, said address information of the web pages being registered as a bookmark." Claim 10 further recites, "switching between automatically displaying contents of the web pages based on the sequence indicated" and "displaying said contents in a user specified sequence in response to a request from the user."

The cited references do not teach or suggest the above-identified features including "switching between automatically displaying contents of the web pages based on the sequence indicated" and "displaying said contents in a user specified sequence in response to a request from the user", as recited in claim 10

It is submitted that new claim 10 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 05/14/07

By: Temnit Afework
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501